

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 091 372

SP 008 045

AUTHOR Hosford, Philip L.; Schroder, Angela
 TITLE Southwestern Leadership Conference on Performance-Based Education.
 INSTITUTION New Mexico State Univ., Las Cruces. Bureau of Educational Research.
 SPONS AGENCY New Mexico Education Association, Santa Fe.; New Mexico State Dept. of Education, Santa Fe. Div. of Instructional Services.
 PUB DATE Mar 74
 NOTE 26p.; Performed-Based Education Conference, New Mexico State University (Las Cruces, New Mexico, March 28-29, 1974)
 EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.75 HC-\$1.85 PLUS POSTAGE
 DESCRIPTORS Conferences; Educational Trends; Opinions; *Performance Based Teacher Education; Programs

ABSTRACT

The following objectives for the conference are indicated: a) to assist interested leaders from all educational levels and agencies to learn more about performance-based education (PBE) strategy: its nature, promise, and problems and its implications for preservice and in-service educational personnel development; b) to assist leaders from all levels to develop more effective ways to collaborate on designing and implementing PBE programs; and c) to assist operators of PBE or PBTE (performance-based teacher education) programs to upgrade the quality of their programs, particularly in the areas of management, research, and assessment. There are two major sections: "What was Said and Recommended" is a series of selected quotes from the participants of the conference and "The Meaning of It All" is a subjective commentary of the status and future of PBE. Also presented is a brief history of the development, rationale, and funding of the conference. (JA)

ED 091372

**SOUTHWESTERN LEADERSHIP
CONFERENCE ON
PERFORMANCE-BASED EDUCATION**

March 28-29, 1974

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

**At: New Mexico State University
Las Cruces, New Mexico**

**A REPORT
by
Philip L. Hosford
Angela Schroder**

SP078 040

Written, Published and Distributed with Support from

Educational Research Center
College of Education
New Mexico State University

Division of Instructional Services
State Department of Education
New Mexico

National Education Association
New Mexico

May, 1974

PREFACE

In March, 1974, individuals from all areas of the education field met to discuss the progress and current status of performance-based education and to discuss how further development might ensue.

Two nationally recognized leaders in performance-based education were among the participants of the conference: Dr. Karl Massanari, chairman of the American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education's Committee on Performance-Based Teacher Education; and Dr. Robert Houston, Associate Dean, College of Education, University of Houston, Houston, Texas. Both men unselfishly shared their knowledge and experiences with other program participants throughout the conference.

In this report, our first efforts are an attempt to reproduce faithfully the interests and concerns expressed during the conference and second, to provide our own personal commentary. We have done our best to report what happened during the conference and to quote participants accurately based on careful review of tape recordings of the sessions.

A major section of this report, entitled "What Was Said at the Conference," includes selected quotes from invited panelists and speakers. We recognize the danger of quoting people out of context and hope you, the reader, are charitable and understand that our intent is only to reflect the flow and flavor of the conference through the quoted statements. To challenge any single one of the quoted statements taken completely out of the context of the informal discussions would be entirely unreasonable and not related to the purpose of providing the reader with a general overall feeling of the conference.

On the other hand, the final section entitled, "The Meaning of It All," is entirely subject to challenge since it is mostly commentary by the writers. Although we are indebted to all the program participants for the direction and substance of our writing, we must, in the final analysis, accept full responsibility for the contents of this final section. We hope our observations will be viewed as constructive and as providing valuable direction to the energies associated with the performance-based education movement.

The first draft of this report was reviewed and critiqued by members of the sponsoring agencies including the National Education Association-New Mexico, the New Mexico State Department of Education, Division of Instructional Services and The College of Education, New Mexico State University. To them we offer our sincere thanks and appreciation for comments and criticisms which led to the final editing and improvement of this report.

Gratitude is expressed to all three sponsoring agencies for the publication and distribution of this report.

Philip L. Hosford
New Mexico State University

Angela Schroder
University of Texas at El Paso

PURPOSES AND ORGANIZATION OF THE REPORT

The valuable discussions, collaboratively-developed recommendations and consensus on problems, hopes and fears derived from a broad base of educational leadership should never be lost to the educational community. Any conference dealing with deep concerns of educators actively involved at many different levels and in many different agencies of the educational enterprise is deserving of record. The impact of bringing together the leadership of classroom teachers, Professional Associations, State Departments of Education, Teacher Training Institutions, PTA and college students should go well beyond the two days of the conference held in March at Las Cruces, New Mexico. Some of what was said and by whom, some important implications and an analysis of the undercurrents, recommendations and hallway talk of the conference need wide broadcast and permanent form for continuous study and evaluation during the coming years of involvement with PBE and its associated effects.

Based on the above rationale, this report was conceptualized to serve four general objectives:

1. To serve as a hard copy summary of the conference for those in attendance.
2. To serve as an informational document for those in the Southwest area who were not able to attend the conference.
3. To provide a direct input from one area of the Southwest to the assessment, direction and evaluation of the performance-based education movement on the national level.
4. To achieve a synthesis of the total conference through a permanent record of selected statements indicating the flavor of the conference, recommendations emerging from the conference, and a general commentary by the writers regarding hopes and fears generated with some consistency throughout the conference.

To serve the above purposes, the report is organized into three major sections which immediately follow this introduction: A Description of the Conference; A Report of What Was Said and Recommended; and, The Meaning of It All — an analysis by the writers.

A final section, the Appendix, contains reproductions of major parts of the program and the listing of actual program participants.

THE CONFERENCE

Rationale

Impetus for the study of performance-based education currently being undertaken has evolved from national, regional, and local sources.

The American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education's Committee on Performance-Based Teacher Education has been charged with the responsibility to study the efforts currently taking place in the United States in the area of performance-based education and to assist in giving direction to the PBTE movement. That Commission's current PBTE series of publications has been nationally recognized as basic information in the field.

Consortia of States, single State agencies, and individual institutions of higher learning have been funded by national agencies to develop and implement performance-based programs.

Contributing to the concern and discussion of performance-based education are the social pressures for accountability and the development of new management systems analysis techniques. Recent Teacher Corps projects have been funded with the intent that they become or develop performance-based programs. The United States Office of Education has funded activities such as the Texas Teacher Center Project which was conceptualized to field-test performance-based teacher education programs in pilot situations and to contribute to a statewide effort to move teacher certification to a performance base.

Actions by state legislatures and state boards of education in the Southwestern United States have led to studies, experimental programs, special fundings and even mandates in Texas and Arizona. However, the Texas Attorney General has recently ruled that the State Board cannot mandate a program such as competency-based education in teacher education programs and progress in Arizona appears uneven and hesitant. In New Mexico, elements of the State Legislature are interested in the concept of performance-based education, and the State Department of Education has formed a task force on competency-based certification and is currently in the process of funding up to ten school districts submitting proposals for the design, development and testing of field-based, performance-based teacher certification programs.

The National Education Association-New Mexico has long been interested in quality education of teachers and students and is studying this concept and its possible impact on students and teachers, especially through its Teacher Education and Professional Standards (TEPS) Commission, currently under the Chairmanship of Dean Jack O. L. Saunders, New Mexico State University.

A year ago, the College of Education at New Mexico State University funded a consultantship to work with all faculty involved with the core professional courses in an effort to move toward a Performance-Based Program. This impetus, with support from Teacher Corps, led to the establishment of the PBE Materials Resource Center now housed in the College.

The convergence of these many forces contributed to the development of the conference at its particular time and place.

Purposes of the Conference

As noted in the program of the conference, the primary purposes of the conference were:

1. To assist interested leaders from all educational levels and agencies to learn more about the PBE strategy: its nature, promise, problems and its implications for preservice and inservice educational personnel development.
2. To assist leaders from all levels to develop more effective ways to work collaboratively in designing and implementing PBE programs.
3. To assist operators of PBE or PBTE programs to upgrade the quality of their programs, particularly in the areas of management, research, and assessment.

Personnel

In addition to Dr. Karl Massanari and Dr. Robert Houston, panelists included the Executive Secretary and other staff members of NEA-New Mexico; members of the NEA-NM Executive Committee; past and present leaders of the Albuquerque Classroom Teachers' Association; both the Assistant Superintendent of Instruction and the Director of Educational

Personnel Development from the New Mexico State Department of Education; leaders in higher education from Universities in New Mexico and Texas; State and Area PTA Executive Committee members in New Mexico; and administrators and teachers from public schools.

Appendix A includes the complete roster of program personnel and position.

Program

The conference program for the first day was designed to present the current status of performance-based education in public schools and in higher education throughout the nation, Texas and New Mexico.

Sessions during the second day were to provide panelists and conference participants the opportunity to conjecture, dream and argue about the value of the performance-based education movement, its relative permanency, its directions and methods of implementation.

Browsing time was provided for visiting the NMSU Materials Resource Center which contains material on performance and competency based education in the forms of literature, cassette tapes, film strips, journals, books, and academic subject matter materials. Approximately 35 categories of information in the center are computerized for constant updating and immediate production of holdings in any category. Services provided by the Center include class usage of materials, demonstrations, visitations, in-service programs, conferences, mail order information, and direct non-profit purchases of materials.

Funding

The sponsoring agencies contributed to the success of the conference in various ways. The Division of Instructional Services of the State Department of Education provided time and funding for personnel to attend.

The National Education Association-New Mexico funded personnel in addition to printing the conference programs and the conference report. Announcements of the conference were mailed by NEA-NM to all superintendents, local association presidents and commission chairmen.

New Mexico State University's Educational Research Center funded travel for other participants, honoraria, secretarial assistance, conference coffee and the luncheon for program participants.

Personnel and facilities were provided by the College of Education, New Mexico State University.

Most initial materials in the Materials Resource Center for PBE were purchased with a grant from Teacher Corps to aid in that organization's thrust in PBE areas. Manpower for establishing the center and its operation were funded primarily through Teacher Corps in part-time professorial and graduate assistant time during the school year 1973-74. Equipment and furniture were purchased from funds provided by the Educational Research Center, College of Education, New Mexico State University. The space used for the Center is allocated through the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education.

WHAT WAS SAID AND RECOMMENDED

Selected Quotes

Facts, opinions, concerns and questions characterized the conference. Selected statements made during the opening session, the panel discussions, the after-dinner speech, and the final session are quoted below in their chronological order of the conference. Obviously, all the statements are quoted out of context and are given here only to provide the reader with a general flavor of the conference.

Darrell Willey: We have never known what's been expected of us. PBE may help to provide us with a good, logical professional definition.

Karl Massanari: PBE is a lever for educational reform with tremendous potential if given good leadership and support.

PBE is not a neatly defined package or program to transport from one institutional setting to another.

PBE does not tell you what the substance of a program should be, what the role of a teacher is, or what competencies a teacher should possess. It forces program developers to do that.

PBTE insists that educators be as explicit as possible in setting goals and objectives, and that they collect evidence that they are doing what they claim to be doing.

Agnes Saunders: We cannot be responsible for all things and need to know how much of students learning is our responsibility.

Humanism is possible in PBE.

Ed Gausson: We're talking about the community helping to set up competencies. Do they do so for doctors? Is PBE just a fad? If it isn't and the strategy is so good, there should be complete involvement from Kindergarten through higher education.

Marshall Farris: The psychology and education professions don't have the grips on the elements of what makes a difference in education, so if we don't know enough about the something, how can we measure it?

Juan Trujillo: Are we professionals? Do we have to prove it?

You can't do anything better if you don't know anything better to try.

Luciano Baca: Who should be competent? Does the degree really mean that much or not? Should the rules be changed?

Norma Hernandez: Effective teachers must be empathetic toward students' values. That empathy is fostered by experiences encouraging cognitive and affective dimensions.

We need more lab work and more field work in our teacher education programs.

Luciano Baca: Two long-range assumptions of CBE: (1) if you change the behavior of the teacher, you change the learning achievement of the kids; (2) Colleges of education in this country are capable of improving the teacher training programs. The two assumptions may be untenable.

Paul Scarbrough: It appears that we are always going to be faced with subjective evaluation or counts in numbers of competencies.

Collaboration can occur between colleges within a university.

Jim Pierce: We're looking for competency-based performance in all educators—the administrator, the counselor, the teacher.

We do not at this time see the Plan for Re-Certification as a mandate. Any one model won't be the model.

Helen Harriger: PBE must be teacher-written, teacher-directed and evaluated with input, acceptance, and cooperation with others affected and concerned.

If we are really collaborating, mandating won't happen. Teachers will already be working with parents, the community, children, the state department.

Jack O. L. Saunders: If PBE is good for teacher education, then why isn't it good for all education? If it's good for teachers, then it must be good for all levels.

Specifying objectives and means of evaluation is itself competency-based education, independent of subject matter.

Learners deserve to know what's expected and how they will be evaluated at all levels.

Bob Houston: We're making a mistake trying to develop a single model of a teacher. Effective teachers don't all exhibit the same competencies.

Institutions in many cases appear to be unwilling to allocate resources in teacher education. PBE requires additional resources.

Expediency in development and certification may negotiate PBE out of existence.

PBE involves all the partners in education.

Robert Wright: Money to support PBE is needed. Training 14,000 people (teachers in New Mexico) to change is going to take a lot of money.

Emmett Shockley: How can we measure teacher performance without measuring kids?

Will we become too concerned with what we'll do and not have time to do it?

Juan Trujillo: What do parents expect from the school relative to their kids?

We have to start looking at valid and reliable research.

There is no sense discussing collaboration if the organizations involved aren't geared for change. Otherwise we may develop another layer on the pyramid of bureaucracy rather than maximizing our resources to help children achieve.

J. Paul Taylor: If PBE seems to many of those involved, faddish, then we need to take a long look before progressing too fast.

Mary Alice Sipes: Evaluation must be viewed in the broad context of the aspirations of parents (community) for their children as expressed in broad goals and objectives of the schools; the readiness of children; working conditions, both material and interpersonal, money; and expected learning outcome with students.

Don Croft: The final word on teaching effectiveness is not yet in. We need to look at current research findings, use them as a base, and make adjustments as more information comes in.

Phil Barck: PBE assessment is subjective, criterion-referenced, rather than norm-referenced.

Karl Massanari: Are we really a profession?

To have or not to have PBE is not the question. The real question is: How do we bring about urgently needed improvements in educational

Karl Massanari: (cont). personnel development? PBE has potential for stimulating these needed improvements.

There has been a tendency to move into PBE too quickly, on too large a scale without adequate preparation and resources. This leads to superficial results.

The teacher must be conceived of as a professional.

Since there is as yet, a limited knowledge based to support performance-based education, states should not take prescriptive action or proscribe PBE. Study and experimentation should be encouraged.

I have been impressed with the cooperation of the involved groups observed during this conference.

Final Group Recommendations

Preceding the final session of the conference, participants were given a choice of attending one of three concurrent sessions in which their own recommendations were to be formulated. Their recommendations were presented to all conference participants during the final session and are reported below. Each of the three reporters were previously instructed to report as faithfully as possible all the recommendations developed by their groups and then add their own editorial comments if desired.

On Implementation: Reported by Bob Houston:

1. There ought to be pilot projects before implementation of performance-based education or certification.
2. The PBE strategy should be integrated philosophically into a continuous program from kindergarten through graduation.
3. We must evaluate what we are doing. We want pilots that can be demonstrated to produce desirable results.
4. There should be inventive programs in the state and a district or group of individuals should not be chided for not participating in PBE programs. We want leadership, not control. We want influence, not power play.

Houston added his personal observation that many programs developed in the past have become rigid and lost the essence of the original intent. During program change, the emphasis on mechanics may encourage losing sight of the program goals. Small, insignificant changes are easily made, but complex, important changes are almost impossible to make. Trying out the concept, testing it in a meaningful way, should be the first intent before we proceed.

On Collaboration: Reported by Paul Scarbrough:

1. Collaboration must be viewed very broadly to include professional organizations, administrators, state departments of education, university professors, parents, students, the public.
2. Collaboration takes place within agencies as well as between agencies.
3. Collaboration must apply to the total educational process, at least from kindergarten through graduate school. PBE is not just for the university.
4. Collaborative involvement must include substructures for continuous change and assessment.
5. We must recognize the power status conflict, differences, and problems which exist at various levels between agencies. Power status conflicts are tied in with individuals' and agencies' self-concepts and can indicate a lack of security. An amount of personal security is required.

Suggestions for aiding collaboration efforts included the formation of an organization made up of representatives who could speak for parents, the community, professional organizations, the school district, and the university which would be kept as autonomous from the individual groups as possible. A second suggestion called for the de-institutionalization of contacts with parents, especially with those who come from lower socio-economic levels.

On Assessment: Reported by Phil Barck:

The group developing recommendations on assessment engaged in quite active discussion regarding the assessment techniques that could

be utilized in performance-based programs. They recommended the following:

1. Assessment must address itself to all components inherent in the concept of PBE.
2. Assessment should not go beyond the data collected.
3. An assessment program is not a testing program. It is not product-oriented.
4. The criteria for assessment should be constantly changing, and should be appropriate to the given level.
5. In-classroom assessment should be done by teachers or students.
6. The bias of assessment needs to be filtered out.
7. Creating bodies of teachers, or groups, to do assessment may lead to the development of super-bodies.
8. Assessment, in order to be effective, should not be mandated.

THE MEANING OF IT ALL

The question of whether performance-based education should be implemented in either the university or public school setting has no definitive answer. A basic concern expressed by participants at this conference was that this might be just another fad or "old wine in new bottles." Some participants felt that education should not climb on the bandwagon, only to jump off in the near future.

The effects of the program on children should be of utmost concern, but this fundamental issue received little notice. Little discussion was noted dealing with how PBE could be most effectively used or, for that matter, if it might be at least as effective as more traditional teaching methods.

Germane to the issue of PBE adoption is the somewhat political question of teacher accountability. The concepts of PBE extended to their theoretical limit could make it possible to quantitatively measure student performance against an absolute scale. The resulting performance can be and has been used as a measure of teaching effectiveness. To many teachers, this represents a threatening and wholly unacceptable circumstance.

Underlying this conference was a basic concern and even a fear that PBE could result in an untenable intrusion upon the teaching profession. Most concerns expressed can be sensed through the sampling of the panelists' statements previously given. Always in the background certain questions seemed to thread their way through the conference: Is this movement primarily political? Might it not serve as a counterforce to growing teacher activism? Is this movement a power play? Who should control certification . . . the State Department of Education? the Colleges? the Professional Associations? Is PBE being used as a subtle approach to do away with tenure? Until we become more sophisticated at evaluating the complex activities of an individual educator, might we not only succeed in reducing the quality of performance to that shallow level measured by the evaluation procedure?

Most PBE programs have been implemented in teacher education programs only within the professional education block of courses. If PBE has that much to offer education, one wonders why it hasn't been considered more actively in the public schools or in other colleges of the universities.

The PBE strategy may encourage educators to take a more critical, analytical look at what they are doing and this questioning should lead to changes that will strengthen current programs. No one claims that PBE should be accepted en toto. PBE programs based on single models of what the teacher or the learner should be are alarming symptoms of an unhealthy bandwagon effect.

Although school goals are often very similar, they also differ in major aspects according to the differing needs of their varying student populations. Programs should be individualized just as the learning programs for students and/or teachers within those programs are individualized. Performance-based education/certification programs should not be transplanted, mandated, or even borrowed.

The need for collaboration came out insistently in sessions dealing with "Implementation" and "Assessment" as well as those dealing directly with "Collaboration." Individual participants, especially those from the public schools and those representing professional organizations emphasized the importance of working together to study PBE strategies. For too long the universities have worked with them in a paternal, one-way communication pattern. University and public school programs could improve, if a two-way communication pattern were more the rule than the exception.

In the same area, concern was expressed that there was not enough common-goal oriented communication among the Professional Associations, the State Department of Education, and the Universities. Open, earnest, professional collaboration on the development, implementation and evaluation of programs would aid each group toward greater achievement of their higher goals, all related to the welfare of students and teachers who live together so many hours of the year. The mandate concept would rapidly become an artifact of our times.

The State Department of Education and elements of the legislature wish to maximize the return on monies distributed throughout the state for education—as do we all. But, for how much of pupil learning can teachers be held responsible? What means of evaluation and assessment will help those teachers striving to improve? Achievement test scores cannot measure the influences of teachers on students. Availability of

this type of evaluation instrument device in no way justifies its singular utilization. For example, in a recent summary of the research on evaluation of teaching at the college level, we find that there is no measurable difference among truly distinctive methods of college instruction when evaluated by student performance on final examinations; based on data from nearly 100 comparative studies of college teaching, differently-taught sections of courses produce a common outcome as measured by performance on examinations.¹

After careful review of the Duluth experience, the writings of Jenks, Jenson, Coleman and others, we find at the public school level that "Within any established, supervised instructional program inaugurated to implement acknowledged curriculum, employing teachers who meet all necessary standards of the organization, only a small part, if any, of differences among scholastic achievement scores can be explained by differences in teachers."²

Clearly the role of the teacher needs further definition. The teacher is no mere dispenser of knowledge, but truly is a facilitator of, or catalyst for, learning and personal development. Basic skills are important, but so too are the enjoyment of learning, the desire to continue learning, the ability for self-initiated learning, and a healthy accurate perception of reality and self.

¹Memo to the Faculty. The Center for Research on Learning and Teaching. University of Michigan, No. 53, February, 1974, p. 4.

²Philip L. Hosford, An Instructional Theory—A Beginning. (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1973), p. 153.

Definitive research findings regarding teacher effectiveness are continuously sought and current activity holds much promise and hope for all of us who are involved. Pilot programs in teacher education and certification jointly sponsored and funded by professional associations, public schools, universities, and state departments can provide even more data, more valuable program-building information and bases on which to make decisions affecting personnel in all areas of education, but especially the children to be educated. Surely, performance-based education, devoid of power-based political ramifications can play a key role in such collaborative efforts.

Summary

The product of the education system is a knowledgeable individual possessing basic abilities to discriminate, critically evaluate and to assimilate new information. Performance-based education can be an extremely useful tool for the educational system in its efforts to develop such individuals.

One of the principal benefits of PBE is the scrutiny to which curriculum is subjected. Exactly what is taught and how it is to be evaluated is stated in detail. This process can lead to a clearer concept on the part of both teachers and students regarding real goals and associated desired performances. Properly used, PBE can help provide valid, definitive procedures for the evaluation of effective teaching. Improperly used, PBE can be a fundamental threat to the rights and responsibilities of the teaching profession and give an alien importance to control rather than the appropriate emphasis to the improvement of all educational efforts on behalf of learners.

Successful implementation of performance-based programs requires the cooperation of large numbers of people from agencies and groups including professional organizations, public schools, universities, state departments, parents and students. To gain this needed cooperation, PBE programs must show indeed that they meet the specific needs of all groups involved. The mandate concept must become defunct.

Performance-based education is an evolutionary step and will require significant amounts of work over and above that required by traditional methods. In one way or another, PBE will make its mark on American education.

ROSTER OF PROGRAM PERSONNEL

Luciano Baca, Assistant Superintendent of Instruction, State Department of Education
Phil Barck, Administrative Assistant, Aztec Public Schools
Don Croft, Coordinator, Research & Design, New Mexico State University
Kathy Easterling, Project Director - ESAA, Hatch Valley Schools, Hatch, New Mexico
Marshall Farris, Immediate Past President of ACTA, Albuquerque, New Mexico
Ed Gaussion, Executive Secretary, NEA - New Mexico
Helen Harriger - ACTA Member, Executive Committee, Albuquerque, New Mexico
Norma Hernandez, Head, Curriculum & Instruction, UTEP, El Paso, Texas
Philip Hosford, Professor of Education and Mathematics, NMSU
Bob Houston, Associate Dean, College of Education, University of Houston, Houston, Texas
Karl Messenari, Associate Director, AACTE, Director, PBTE Project, American Association of
Colleges for Teacher Education, One Dupont Circle, Suite 610, Washington, D. C. 20036
Jim Pierce, Director, Educational Personnel Development, State Department of Education
Jerald Reece, Head, Elementary & Secondary Education, NMSU
Agnes Saunders, Teacher, Valley View School, Las Cruces, New Mexico
Jack O. L. Saunders, Dean, College of Education, NMSU
Paul Scarbrough, Director of Field Experiences, College of Education, UTEP, El Paso, Texas
Emmett Shockley, Superintendent, Deming, New Mexico
Mary Alice Sipes, Deputy Executive Secretary, NEA - New Mexico
Catherine Smith, President, NEA - New Mexico
Paul Taylor, Director, Curriculum and Instruction, Las Cruces Public Schools
Mary Thompson, Secretary & Executive Committee Member, State PTA
Juan Trujillo, Program Development Specialist, New Mexico Highlands University, Las Vegas,
New Mexico
Darrell Willey, Associate Director, Educational Research Center, College of Education, NMSU
Irene Willey, Coordinator, Learning Centers for Language, Las Cruces Public Schools
Robert Wright, Professor, Elementary & Secondary Education, NMSU

SOUTHWESTERN LEADERSHIP CONFERENCE
ON
PERFORMANCE-BASED EDUCATION

Las Cruces, New Mexico
March 28-29, 1974
Thursday and Friday, noon to noon

Sponsored by
NEA New Mexico
Division of Instructional Services - SDE
The College of Education, New Mexico State University

For all those interested in Performance-Based Education (PBE) as it relates to Teachers, Counselors, Administrators, Supervisors, State Department of Education, Professional Associations, Colleges and Universities, the Legislative and Lay Public.

CONFERENCE OBJECTIVES

The primary purposes of this conference are:

1. To assist interested leaders from all educational levels and agencies to learn more about the PBE strategy: its nature, promise, problems and its implications for pre-service and inservice educational personnel development.
2. To assist leaders from all levels to develop more effective ways to work collaboratively in designing and implementing PBE programs.
3. To assist operators of PBE or PBTE programs to upgrade the quality of their programs, particularly in the areas of management, research, and assessment.

Participants Objectives: Participants are encouraged to formulate explicitly their own objectives for attending this conference so they might make wise choices from among the alternative learning activities available throughout the conference. During the final session, each participant will be given the opportunity to evaluate the conference in relation to the achievement of his or her own objectives.

Conference Headquarters: The nerve center for the Conference is located in Room 310, O'Donnell Hall (South end of top floor.) If you have questions, or need help, come to the center where you may contact staff, program personnel, exchange message, or arrange ad hoc meetings.

Materials Resource Center on PBE: This center is an integral part of Room 310. A 'hands on' display of articles, books, modules, monographs and other materials are available for your study. You may purchase some materials directly from the center at cost, or center personnel will aid you in your own ordering processes. Personnel will be on hand to answer any questions you may have regarding any of the materials in the center.

Program: To assist you in planning your activities for the conference, a program overview in the form of a flow chart is included on the next pages. Following the overview is a detailed program and Roster of Program Participants.

THE PROGRAM

Thursday March 28

New Mexico State University

- | | | |
|--------------|--|-----------------------------------|
| 11:00 - 1:00 | Registration and Browsing in PBE Materials Center | Top Floor, O' Donnell, Room 310 |
| 1:00 - 2:00 | Welcome . . . Jack O. L. Saunders
Conference Instructions . . . Darrell Willey
Introduction of Speaker . . . Phil Hosford
"Where Are We in PBE - A National View"
Karl Massanari, Washington, D. C. | Room 300 |
| 2:00 - 3:30 | Choice of three concurrent sessions:
1. PBE Potential and Probable Impact in the public schools
Panelists: Ed Gausson
Marshall Farris
Agnes Saunders
Moderator: Walter Smith
2. PBE in Higher Education
Panelists: Juan Trujillo
Luciano Baca
Norma Hernandez
Moderator: Catherine Smith
3. Collaboration: Efforts in PBE
Panelists: Jim Pierce
Helen Harriger
Jack O. L. Saunders
Moderator: Paul Scarbrough | Room 300
Room 315
Room 316 |
| 3:30 - 5:00 | Choice of three concurrent sessions:
Repeat of Sessions 1 - 3 above | |
| 6:00 - 7:00 | No Host Bar | Palms Motor Hotel
West Picacho |
| 7:00 - 9:00 | Banquet
"PBE, Its Pitfalls, Pratfalls, and Promises"
Bob Houston, Houston, Texas | Palms Motor Hotel |

Friday, March 23

8:30 - 9:00	Good Morning! Coffee in	Room 310
9:00 - 10:00	Choice of three concurrent sessions	
	7. Problems in Implementing PBE Programs	Room 300
	Panelists: Emmett Shockley Walter Smith Norma Hernandez	
	Moderator: Don Smith	
	8. Developing Collaborative Programs	Room 315
	Panelists: Catherine Smith Juan Trujillo Paul Taylor	
	Moderator: Ed Gausson	
	9. Assessment Problems in PBE	Room 316
	Panelists: Mary Alice Sipes Don Croft Alan Morgan	
	Moderator: Marshall Farris	
10:00 - 11:15	Choice of three concurrent sessions for developing recommendations from this leadership conference	
	10. On the Implementation of PBE Programs	Room 300
	Moderator: Kathy Easterling	
	11. On Collaboration in PBE Programs	Room 315
	Moderator: Irene Willey	
	12. On Assessment in PBE Programs	Room 316
	Moderator: Jerald Reece	
11:15 - 12:15	Final Session	Room 300
	Reports from Sessions 10, 11, and 12	
	10. Bob Houston (on implementation)	
	11. Paul Scarbrough (on collaboration)	
	12. Alan Morgan (on assessment)	
	Review of Conference, Synthesis and the Future of PBE	
	Karl Massanari	
12:15	Luncheon on your own Ad hoc meetings Have a pleasant trip home!	